

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/437,246

Applicant(s)

SHINADA ET AL.

Examiner

Michael P Nghiem

Art Unit

2863

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael P Nghiem.

(3) _____.

(2) Kelly Hyndman.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 03 December 2002.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-54.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nagasaki, Shinada.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: In regard to claim 1, Applicants argue that plate (20) of Nagasaki is not a film for sealing the ink supply port and there is no motivation to incorporate the sealing film (56) and needle (550) of Shinada to the printhead cartridge of Nagasaki. In regard to claim 51, Applicants argue Nagasaki does not teach a direction of the ink channel to be the same as the sealing direction. Examiner withdraws rejection of claim 53. In regard to claim 54, Applicants argue that Nagasaki does not teach the distances as claimed. In regards to claims 1, 51, and 54, Examiner will reconsider Applicants arguments.